

Date: Wed, 6 Jul 94 04:30:12 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #298
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 6 Jul 94 Volume 94 : Issue 298

Today's Topics:

Existing regulations limit our advancement.

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 06 Jul 1994 02:58:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!
wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Existing regulations limit our advancement.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

steve@sheridan.ncd.com (Steve Wilson) writes:

>In article <070394123154Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)
writes:

>|> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>|>

>|> >In article <070194232633Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)
writes:

>|> >>The FCC, as I understand it, considers these to be ancillary functions of
>|> >>the repeater (like the patch) and can be restricted. The repeater is under
>|> >>automatic control when a patch is made. Remember the person bringing up
>|> >>the patch may not be and probably is NOT a control operator of the
>|> >>repeater. They are accessing an ancillary function.
>|> >

>|> >97.109(e) No station may be automatically controlled while transmitting
>|> >third-party communications, except a station retransmitting digital

>|> >packet radio communications on the 6 m and shorter wavelength bands.
>|> >
>|> >It may be widely violated, but 97.109(e) is still on the books. Any
>|> >time a patch is in use, a real live control operator with the ability
>|> >to control transmission by some means other than by on the input channel
>|> >signals must be present at a control point.
>|>
>|> Part 97.205 provides for 'ancillary' functions of a repeater. The autopatch
>|> is an ancillary function of the repeater, thus being under part 97.205
>|> inclusive. And may be 'controlled' over the input. Part 97.205 (d) allows
>|> automatic control of a repeater. Arguably, repeaters are treated separately
>|> under 97.205 and the restrictions of 97.109 (e) may not apply to repeater
>|> stations.
>|>
>|> Dan
>|> --
>|> "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
>|> of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
>|> course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
>|> DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775
>|> +=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me
>|>
>
>Dan,
>
>I think you are confusing the point of 97.205. Repeaters ARE NOT
>exempt from the requirements of 97.109(e).
>
>The ancillary function allowance permits the phone to be dialed up
>from the input frequency of the repeater. It permits the playing of
>recorded messages, etc from "control signals" coming in on the input
>frequency of the repeater AS OPPOSED to the "control point" of the
>repeater.
>
>97.109(e) requires that during any third party traffic occurring on
>the repeater(not caring who caused the third party traffic) , that a
>control operator be present at the control point.
>
>So, 97.205 allows anyone on the input of the repeater to operate the patch,
>but 97.109(e) requires that a "control operator" be in the background monitoring
>the activity while any third-party traffic transpires.
>
>You have to take both of these together...there is not separation of the
>two rules.

I apologize for quoting the entire message I do so for content purposes.
Apparently there is a large section in this group that has a problem
understanding English. I said "ARGUABLY". I said that a credible argument

COULD be made. That arguement could be lost as to point of fact. I made NO comment as to that point of fact. Nor my PERSONAL opinion as to the current state of the interpretation of the rules. If I was unclear as to the intent of my post I appologize, I assumed that 'arguably' would be understood. This group should, ARGUABLY, be intelegent enough to understand the word.

Part 97 has to be taken as a whole, no arguement. The INTENT of the section would have to be exaimened before I could make a comment as to the reason the FCC enacted it.

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775
=+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #298
